



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/016,682

10/31/2001

Akihiro Yoshitani

CANO:039

2566

37013 7590 03/20/2008
ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP.
P.O. BOX 826
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

EXAMINER

HUNTSINGER, PETER K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/20/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/016,682	Applicant(s) YOSHITANI ET AL.	
	Examiner PETER K. HUNTSINGER	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,6,15 and 16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5,6,15 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 12/20/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues on page 5 of the response in essence that:

Kim '937 does not teach adding or not adding white data based on the transmission selection.

a. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Misawa '382 discloses an image processing apparatus that can transmit image data by email or facsimile (S01 of Fig. 3, col. 4, lines 45-51, electronic mail transmission unit or facsimile transmission unit is selected). Kim '937 discloses adding white pixels to image data to data that is transmitted by facsimile (col. 3, lines 58-63, in order to compensate for the difference between the transmission size and the original document size, white pixels are added). Because Kim '937 teaches adding white pixels for only facsimile transmission (to compensate for the difference between the original image size and the transmission or paper size), the reference does not have to state expressly that this process would not be applied to an electronic mail transmission, or any other transmission method. Furthermore, there would be no

reason to add white pixel data to electronic mail data as electronic mail data is not regularly formatted to a paper size and printed like the case of facsimile data. Therefore, the combination of Misawa '382 and Kim '937 teaches adding white pixel data to an image for facsimile transmission but not adding white pixel data for electronic mail transmission.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 6, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misawa '382 in view of Kim '937.

Referring to claim 1, Misawa et al. disclose an image processing apparatus (composite communication apparatus 10 of Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 19-35) comprising:

an inputter arranged to input image data representing an image (image reading unit 15 of Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 19-35);

a first producer arranged to produce data for transmission by facsimile based on the image data input by said inputter (facsimile unit 80 of Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 19-35);

a second producer arranged to produce data for transmission by electronic mail based on the image data input by said inputter (email transmission unit 17 of Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 19-35);

a selector arranged to select a facsimile transmission or an electronic mail transmission based on an instruction by a user (S01 of Fig. 3, col. 4, lines 45-51, electronic mail transmission unit or facsimile transmission unit is selected); and

a controller arranged to control said first and second producers in a manner such that when the data for transmission by electronic mail is produced by said second producer in accordance with a selection of the electronic mail transmission by said selector, the data for transmission by electronic mail is produced without a processor adding white data to the image data input by said inputter to alter the size of the image represented by the input image data to the predetermined image size even if the image represented by the input image data is smaller than the predetermined image size (S62 and S78 of Fig. 6)

Misawa '382 does not disclose expressly altering the size of the image to a predetermined image size if the image is to be sent by facsimile.

Kim '937 discloses a processor arranged to process image data input by an inputter in a manner such that the image represented by the image data has a predetermined image size by adding white data to the image data input by said inputter (col. 3, lines 58-63, in order to compensate for the difference between the transmission size and the original document size, white pixels are added); and

when the data for transmission by facsimile is produced by a first producer in accordance with a selection of the facsimile transmission, the data for transmission by facsimile is produced after said processor adds the white data to the image data input by said inputter to alter the size of the image represented by the input image data to the

predetermined image size for transmission by facsimile if the image represented by the input image data is smaller than the predetermined image size (col. 3, lines 58-63, in order to compensate for the difference between the transmission size and the original document size, white pixels are added).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add white pixels to an image to reach a predetermined image size when the image is sent via facsimile. The motivation for doing so would have been compensate for the difference between the original image size and the transmission or paper size. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kim '937 with Misawa '382 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Referring to claim 2, Misawa '382 discloses wherein said inputter inputs the image data from a reader which reads the image and generates the image data based on the image (image reading unit 15 of Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 19-35).

Referring to claim 3, Misawa '382 discloses wherein said inputter inputs the image data from a detachable memory (image reading unit 15 of Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 19-35). Misawa '382 discloses that the scanner can be separate from the composite communication apparatus (col. 7, lines 31-52). It is inherent that the scanner has memory for receiving image data. The scanner can be detached from the system because it is a separate device, therefore the image reading unit 15 is a detachable memory.

Referring to claim 6, Misawa '382 discloses wherein said controller restricts operations of said first and second producers according to a predetermined condition (S56 of Fig. 6, col. 6, lines 13-17).

Referring to claim 15, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

Referring to claim 16, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misawa '382 and Kim '937 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Morigami '934.

Referring to claim 5, Misawa '382 discloses wherein said controller controls said first producer and said second producer but does not disclose expressly using different gamma values for producing the data.

Morigami '934 discloses different gamma values in producing data for facsimile and monitors (col. 9, lines 59-67, typical gamma coefficient is 0.45 for CRT and 0.65-0.8 for a facsimile machine).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to produce an image for facsimile transmission with a different gamma value than producing an image for email. The motivation for doing so would have been to utilize typical gamma values in producing the images to obtain accurate images. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Morigami '934 with Misawa '382 and Kim '937 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PETER K. HUNTSINGER whose telephone number is (571)272-7435. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571)272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PKH

/David K Moore/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625